arXiv:1409.6885v1 [math.ST] 24 Sep 2014

An objective look at obtaining the plotting positions for QQ-plots

Reza Hosseini[a], Akimichi Takemura[b],
[a]IBM Research Collaboratory, Singapore
[b]Department of Mathematical Informatics, University of Tokyo, Japan
[a]rezah@sg.ibm.com

Abstract

Choosing the plotting positions for the QQ-plot has been a subject of much debate in the statistical and engineering literature. This paper looks at this problem objectively by considering three frameworks: distribution-theoretic; decision-theoretic; game-theoretic. In each framework, we derive the plotting positions and show that there are more than one legitimate solution depending on the practitioner's objective. This work clarifies the choice of the plotting positions by allowing one to easily find the mathematical equivalent of their view and choose the corresponding solution. This work also discusses approximations to the plotting positions when no closed form is available.

Key Words: Plotting position; Loss function; Invariant; QQ-plot; Distribution-free

1 Introduction

A quantile-quantile plot (QQ-plot) is a graphical method for comparing observed data with a proposed (estimated) distribution. Often the order statistics of the data are compared with the quantiles of a distribution which is fitted to the data. For example a normal distribution can be fitted to observed independent data: $x_1, \cdots, x_n$, using maximum likelihood method: $\hat{X} \sim N(\hat{\mu}, \hat{\sigma}^2)$ and then to check the goodness of the fit, one can plot the order statistics, $x_{(1)}, \cdots, x_{(n)}$ (data arranged in non-decreasing order), versus the quantiles of the estimated distribution $\hat{X}$: $(q_{\hat{X}}(p_1), \cdots, q_{\hat{X}}(p_n))$ for an appropriate choice of probabilities $0 < p_1 \leq p_2 \leq \cdots \leq p_n < 1$, which we call a *probability index vector* (PIV). The choice of the PIV is the so called *plotting positions problem*. In fact we can view this problem more generally by plotting $x_{(1)}, \cdots, x_{(n)}$, versus $f_1(\hat{X}), \cdots, f_n(\hat{X})$, where $f_1, \cdots, f_n$ are functions of the distribution of $\hat{X}$ – without mentioning or using quantiles. However one can always apply the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of $\hat{X}$, $F_{\hat{X}}$ to $(f_1(\hat{X}), \cdots, f_n(\hat{X}))$ to get back a PIV, $(p_1, \cdots, p_n)$, and therefore the problem can be viewed as finding the appropriate PIV at least in the continuous case, which is the case we consider here.

The plotting positions problem has received significant attention in the literature. The approaches suggested can be divided into two general cases: (1) distribution-free methods; (2) distribution-dependent methods. In (1) PIV does not depend on the underlying distribution of the data and in (2) one utilizes

some assumptions regarding the distribution of the data in finding the plotting positions. One may argue that in (2) if the shape of the distribution is known, a QQ-plot is not useful. This is not the case because: we may have only partial information about the shape of the distribution, for example we may know that the underlying distribution is a Gamma distribution and like to compare the data to a fit from the Exponential distribution (a special case of Gamma distribution); even in the case that the assumed distribution and the fitted distribution are the same, the QQ-plot can tell us how well the estimated distribution is performing across the range of the quantiles. In this paper, we mainly focus on solving (1) but will clarify the difference in our discussion.

Weibull (1939) originally suggested $p_i = i/(n+1)$ (Weibull method) and many other authors such as Yu and Huang (2001) and Harter (1984) addressed this problem. Makkonen (2008) provided evidence for the Weibull method by showing that the probability of non-exceedance of a new sample, denoted by X_f, from $X_{(i)}$ is exactly equal to $i/(n+1)$: $P(X_f \leq X_{(i)}) = i/(n+1)$. However some other authors (e.g. Lozano-Aguilera, Estudillo-Martínez and Castillo-Gutiérrez (2014)) provide evidence for another intuitively appealing, distribution-free solution to this problem which consists of the median of the Beta distribution of the CDF applied to the order statistics: $Med\{F_X(X_{(i)})\} = Med\{Beta(i, n+1-i)\}$ (discussed in Beard (1943), Benard and Bos-Levenbach (1953), Folland and Anderson (2002), Hosseini (2009)). We call this method, the *Beta Median* (BM) method.

The contributions of this work are as follows. (1) It systematically defines intuitively appealing and rigorous mathematical objectives to compare the plotting positions schemes and in each case finds the optimal plotting positions from three points of view: distribution-theoretic; decision-theoretic; game-theoretic. Most of the other relevant works consider a distribution-theoretic approach and obtain different solutions from various assumptions (e.g. Makkonen (2008) and Lozano-Aguilera, Estudillo-Martínez and Castillo-Gutiérrez (2014)). These solutions are compared here. The decision-theoretic and game-theoretic views are new to the best of our knowledge. In the decision-theoretic framework, we find the optimal positions by minimizing appropriate loss functions defined for quantiles. In the game-theoretic framework, we define intuitively appealing games in which two players choose plotting positions and after the true distribution (or a future sample) is revealed, they exchange money based on the outcome. (2) This work provides a careful investigation of the accuracy of several approximations to the median of the Beta distribution, specifically developed for finding the optimal plotting positions (mostly of the form $(i-a)/(n+b)$ for some constants a, b, e.g. discussed in Cunnane (1978)) along the PIV $(p_1, \cdots, p_n)$ for small and large n. This work also provides a comprehensive comparison between the two popular solutions of the plotting positions problem (based on the expectation and median of the corresponding Beta distribution) for arbitrary sample sizes in terms of their difference and fraction.

Section 2 considers three mathematical frameworks to address this problem: a distribution-theoretic framework; a decision-theoretic framework; a game-theoretic framework. The decision-theoretic and game-theoretic frameworks can

guide a practitioner to choose the appropriate PIV. In each of these frameworks, we find the optimal PIV or state that it is not possible to find a distribution-free solution. In the distribution-theoretic approach, we consider the distribution of either the order statistics or their CDF and analyze what quantities of the estimated distribution match these random values better. The decision-theoretic framework uses appropriate loss functions for quantiles which are invariant under monotonic transformations of data (and distributions) to pick the optimal PIV. In the game-theoretic approach, we envision some gambling games in which players pick a PIV in order to compete for monetary values and the solution to the plotting positions problem is deduced from the optimal strategy of the player. Section 3 discusses some approximations to the Beta Median method and shows that for an approximation of the popular form $(i-a)/(n+1-2a)$, to perform well at p_1, p_n, when n becomes large, it is necessary to have $a = \log(e/2)$ (where log denotes natural logarithm). However for such choice of a, this approximation is not very accurate in some percentiles, for example around the $10th$ percentile of the data. We show that the algorithm developed by Cran, Martin and Thomas (1977) performs well across the data range. This algorithm is implemented in R for calculating the quantiles of a given Beta distribution but is not the default for calculating plotting positions. Section 4 compares the PIV of Weibull method to the PIV of Beta Median method. We make a comparison between the plotting positions both in terms of their difference and ratio. The plotting positions of the two methods are always close in terms of their difference. They are also close in terms of their ratio toward the center of PIV, but they differ at the two ends of the PIV.

2 Choosing the plotting positions

First we introduce notation for the rest of the paper. Let $X_1, \cdots, X_n$ be a univariate independent identically distributed (i.i.d) sample from a continuous random variable X with CDF F_X. We denote the quantile function (the inverse of F_X) by q_X and the non-decreasingly ordered sample by $X_{(1)}, \cdots, X_{(n)}$. Then we define $U_i = F_X(X_i),\ i = 1, 2, \cdots, n$ to be the (random) probability of non-exceedance from each sample point. Note that the U_i sequence is i.i.d with uniform distribution on [0,1] and denote the ordered sample by $U_{(i)}$. Since F_X is non-decreasing, we have, $U_{(i)} = F_X(X_{(i)})$. It can be shown that $U_{(i)}$ follows a Beta distribution (e.g. Folland and Anderson (2002)) with density function:

$$f_{\alpha,\beta}(x) = \frac{\Gamma(\alpha+\beta)}{\Gamma(\alpha)\Gamma(\beta)} x^{\alpha-1}(1-x)^{\beta-1}, \tag{1}$$

for $\alpha = i$ and $\beta = n + 1 - i$. We denote this distribution by $Beta(i, n + 1 - i)$. In the following we find the optimal plotting positions using three frameworks: distribution-theoretic approach; decision-theoretic approach; game-theoretic approach.

2.1 Distribution-theoretic approach

Here we use distribution theory to find the plotting positions. Suppose we intend to create a QQ-plot of the order statistics with respect to a proposed distribution $\hat{X}$ with CDF $F_{\hat{X}}$. In order to find the location of plotting positions for the order statistics $X_{(i)}$, we can consider the solution to be any of the following:

- The plotting position for $X_{(i)}$ should be the value of F_X at the average of $X_{(i)}$ in an appropriate sense, for example the expectation or the median:

$$p_i^E := F_X(E\{X_{(i)}\}), \text{ or } p_i^M := F_X(q_{X_{(i)}}(1/2)).$$

  Then p_i^E is not distribution-free. In order to show that, consider the special case of a random sample with only one element ($n = i = 1$) and let X be distributed as exponential distribution with parameter λ and CDF $F_X(x) = 1 - \exp(-\lambda x),\ x \geq 0$. Then

$$p_1^E := F_X(E\{X_{(1)}\}) = F_X(E\{X\}) = F_X(\lambda^{-1}) = 1 - \exp(-\lambda^2),$$

  which depends on λ. However p_i^M is distribution-free because for a strictly increasing function $\phi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$:

$$F_{\phi(X)}(q_{\phi(X)_{(i)}}(1/2)) = F_{\phi(X)}(q_{\phi(X_{(i)})}(1/2) =$$

$$F_{\phi(X)}(\phi(q_{X_{(i)}}(1/2))) = F_X(q_{X_{(i)}}(1/2)).$$

  Therefore in order to calculate p_i^M, we can assume X is a uniform distribution on [0,1], which we denote by U. We conclude

$$p_i^M = F_U(q_{U_{(i)}}(1/2)) = q_{U_{(i)}}(1/2),$$

  and therefore p_i^M is equal to the median of $Beta(i, n+1-i)$. In fact Lozano-Aguilera, Estudillo-Martínez and Castillo-Gutiérrez (2014) suggest using p_i^M as an intuitively appealing formula for plotting positions and develop polynomial equations to find them. These polynomials were also developed in Hosseini (2009) (pages 234 and 235) where the choice for the plotting positions is motivated by a decision-theoretic approach.

- The plotting position for $X_{(i)}$ should be the value in $F_{\hat{X}}$, corresponding to the average $U_{(i)}$ in an appropriate sense, either the expectation or the median:

$$p_i^E := E\{U_{(i)}\}, \text{ or } p_i^M := q_{U_{(i)}}(1/2).$$

  Since $U_{(i)} \sim Beta(i, n + 1 - i)$, $p_i^E = i/(n + 1)$ and the median does not have closed form. Later we will discuss the approximations to this median.

- Consider a new unobserved sample X_f. Then the plotting position of $X_{(i)}$ should be the probability of non-exceedance of this new sample, X_f, from $X_{(i)}$: $P(X_f \leq X_{(i)}) = i/(n + 1)$, which is the same as Weibull method. This is essentially the content of Makkonen (2006) and Makkonen (2008).

2.2 Decision-theoretic approach

In this section, we take a decision-theoretic approach by considering appropriate loss functions for assigning the plotting positions. For example, we can measure the loss by the absolute value loss $|X_{(i)} - q_X(p)|$. Since it is a random quantity, we minimize the expected loss:

$$p_i = \underset{p\in[0,1]}{argmin}\ E\{|X_{(i)} - q_X(p)|\}.$$

Again the solution to this is not distribution-free since a loss function defined as such is not distribution-free (or equivalently it is not invariant under strictly monotonic distributions).

Hosseini (2009) and Hosseini (2010) introduced loss functions for quantiles which are invariant under strictly monotonic functions. The *Probability Loss (PL) function* corresponding to a random variable X with distribution function F_X is defined to be

$$\delta_X(a,b) := P(a < X < b) + P(b < X < a), \tag{2}$$

which is simply equal to $|F_X(b) - F_X(a)|$ if the distribution is continuous. Also note that δ_X only depends on the random variable X through its distribution F_X. Therefore we can apply this definition to a distribution function F_X and denote it by δ_{F_X}. We can also apply this loss to functions of data, D_1, D_2 (e.g. $D_1 = X_{(3)}, D_2 = X_{(4)}$): $\delta_X(D_1, D_2) = |F_X(D_2) - F_X(D_1)|$. Hosseini (2010) showed many desirable properties of this loss function, in particular its invariance under strictly monotonic transformations of the real numbers: Let $\phi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, be a strictly monotonic function, then PL satisfies the following invariance:

$$\delta_X(a,b) = \delta_{\phi(X)}(\phi(a), \phi(b)). \tag{3}$$

Moreover, this loss is symmetric and it can be shown that it satisfies the triangle inequality for the continuous variables (Hosseini (2010)). Since this loss is random in general, we need to consider a measure of average loss such as expectation.

To obtain a distribution-free solution, we utilize the *Expected PL* (EPL):

$$p_i = \underset{p\in[0,1]}{argmin} E\{\delta_X(X_{(i)}, q_X(p))\}. \tag{4}$$

We also assume that the underlying distribution is continuous. Then the solution and its properties are given in the following theorem.

Theorem 2.1 *Suppose a random sample $X_1, \cdots, X_n$ from a continuous distribution function F is given. Then*

$$E\{\delta_X(X_{(i)}, q_X(p_i))\},$$

is minimized uniquely by $p_i = Med\{Beta(i, n+1-i)\}$. Moreover p_i is the solution of the equation $\sum_{j=i}^{n} \binom{n}{j} u^j (1-u)^{n-j} = 1/2$, when solving for u, and we have $p_i = 1 - p_{n-i+1}$.

Proof For the first part, note that we want to minimize:

$$E\{\delta_{F_X}(X_{(i)}, q(p))\} = E\{|F(X_{(i)}) - p|\} = E\{|U_{(i)} - p|\}.$$

However $E\{|U_{(i)} - p|\}$ is minimized by choosing p to be the median of $\{U_{(i)}\}$ and we know that $U_{(i)} \sim Beta(i, n+1-i)$.

To prove p_i is the solution of the equation $\sum_{j=i}^{n} \binom{n}{j} u^j (1-u)^{n-j} = 1/2$, when solving for u, note that under the continuity assumption, we have

$$E\{\delta_{F_X}(X_{(i)}, q_X(p_i))\} = E\{|F_X(X_{(i)}) - p_i|\}.$$

Since F_X is a continuous random variable, $F_X(X_{(i)})$ is also continuous. Hence the minimum is obtained by solving $P(F_X(X_{(i)}) \leq x) = 1/2$. This is equivalent to $P(X_{(i)} \leq q_F(x)) = 1/2$. It is well-known that (e.g. Arnold, Balakrishnan and Nagaraja (1992)) the distribution of the order statistics, $X_{(i)}$ is given by

$$P(X_{(i)} \leq y) = \sum_{j=i}^{n} \binom{n}{j} F_X(y)^j (1 - F_X(y))^{n-j}.$$

Hence, the minimum is obtained by solving

$$\sum_{j=i}^{n} \binom{n}{j} F_X(q_X(u))^j (1 - F_X(q_X(u)))^{n-j} = \sum_{j=i}^{n} \binom{n}{j} u^j (1-u)^{n-j} = 1/2,$$

which does not have a closed form solution in general. Also note that the solution does not depend on F_X. However, the solution always exists and is unique since $\sum_{j=i}^{n} \binom{n}{j} u^j (1-u)^{n-j}$ is monotonic for each i, continuous on [0,1] and ranges between 0 and 1.

Finally the fact that the resulting PIV is symmetric follows from the symmetry of the Beta CDF as seen in Equation 1. ■

These equations can be solved for $n = 1, 2$. For $n = 1$, we have $p_1 = 1/2$. For $n = 2$, we have $p_1 = 1 - 1/\sqrt{2}$ and $p_2 = 1/\sqrt{2}$. Note that for arbitrary n, the last equation is $x^n = 1/2$. Hence we have $p_n = 1/\sqrt[n]{2}$ and $p_1 = 1 - 1/\sqrt[n]{2}$.

Hosseini (2010) introduced a related non-random loss which does not require taking the expectations and is more appropriate when the future sample is of interest. The *future-value probability loss* (FPL) for functions of data D_1, D_2 (e.g. $D_1(X_1, \cdots, X_n) = X_{(1)}, D_2(X_1, \cdots, X_n) = X_{(n)}$), is defined by

$$\gamma_X(D_1, D_2) := P(D_1 < X_f < D_2) + P(D_2 < X_f < D_1), \tag{5}$$

where $X_f \sim X$ a new independent draw (future draw) of the random variable of interest. Again we can show the desirable properties of this loss including an its invariance under strictly monotonic transformations: If two statistics (functions of data), D_1, D_2, are *equivariant* under a strictly monotonic transformation ϕ, i.e.

$$\phi(D_i(X_1, \cdots, X_n)) = D_i(\phi(X_1), \cdots, \phi(X_n)), \;\; i = 1, 2,$$

then

$$\gamma_X(D_1, D_2) = \gamma_{\phi(X)}(\phi(D_1), \phi(D_2)). \tag{6}$$

Note that γ_X is not random. Therefore, we let:

$$p_i = \underset{p\in[0,1]}{argmin}\ \gamma_X(X_{(i)}, q_X(p)).$$

Theorem 2.2 *The plotting position for $X_{(i)}$ by minimizing $\gamma_X(X_{(i)}, q_X(p))$ is given by $p_i = Med\{Beta(i, n+1-i)\}$.*

Proof We denote the CDF of $X_{(i)}$ by F_i and proceed as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma_X(X_{(i)}, q_X(p)) &= P(X_{(i)} < X_f < q_X(p)) + P(q_X(p) < X_f < X_{(i)}) \\
&= \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} P(x < X_f < q_X(p))dF_i(x) + \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} P(q_X(p) < X_f < x)dF_i(x) \\
&= \int_{-\infty}^{q_X(p)} (p - F(x))dF_i(x) + \int_{q_X(p)}^{+\infty} (F(x) - p)dF_i(x) \\
&= \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} |F(x) - p|dF_i(x) = E\{|F_i(X) - p|\},
\end{aligned}$$

which is again minimized at $p = Med\{Beta(i, n+1-i)\}$. ■

2.3 Game-theoretic approach

Here we provide a game-theoretic approach for the plotting positions problem. Since we are mainly interested in distribution-free results, we formulate the games in terms of $U_{(i)}$. However they can also be formulated in terms of $X_{(i)}$ to get distribution-dependent results. This framework clarifies which plotting positions scheme is the most appropriate for the given objective. We consider four games in which two players A and B, use their method of picking the plotting positions for $U_{(i)}$, denoted by p_i^A, p_i^B respectively and bet on the result. When the true distribution is revealed, A and B exchange money according to one of the four following rules.

- **Game (1):** When the true distribution is revealed, A wins if:

  $$|U_{(i)} - p_i^A| < |U_{(i)} - p_i^B|,$$

  in which case B pays one dollar to A and otherwise receives a dollar from A. The solution to this game is given in the following theorem.

  Theorem 2.3 *For Game (1), $Med\{Beta(i, n+1-i)\}$ is the best strategy.*

Proof We claim that if A picks $p_i^A = Med\{Beta(i, n+1-i)\}$, he will insure for any $p_i^B \neq p_i^A$:

$$P\{|U_{(i)} - p_i^A| < |U_{(i)} - p_i^B|\} > 1/2.$$

To show that, note that $p_i^A, p_i^B \geq 0$ and we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
& P\{|U_{(i)} - p_i^A| < |U_{(i)} - p_i^B|\} > 1/2 \\
\Leftrightarrow \quad & P\{(U_{(i)} - p_i^A)^2 < (U_{(i)} - p_i^B)^2\} > 1/2 \\
\Leftrightarrow \quad & P\{U_{(i)}(p_i^B - p_i^A) < (p_i^B - p_i^A)\frac{p_i^A + p_i^B}{2}\} > 1/2 \\
\Leftrightarrow \quad & \begin{cases} P\{U_{(i)} > \frac{p_i^A + p_i^B}{2}\} > 1/2, & p_i^B < p_i^A \\ P\{U_{(i)} < \frac{p_i^A + p_i^B}{2}\} > 1/2, & p_i^B > p_i^A. \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

The last equation holds if and only if p_i^A is the median of $U_{(i)}$:

$$Med\{Beta(i, n+1-i)\}.$$

■

- **Game (2):** When the true distribution is revealed, A pays

  $$|U_{(i)} - p_i^A| - |U_{(i)} - p_i^B|,$$

  dollars to B. Note that a negative value means A receives the magnitude of the value. To find the best strategy for this game A needs to minimize $E\{|U_{(i)} - p_i^A|\}$, which is minimized again for $q_{U_{(i)}}(1/2)$.

- **Game (3):** When the true distribution is revealed, A pays

  $$(U_{(i)} - p_i^A)^2 - (U_{(i)} - p_i^B)^2,$$

  dollars to B. Note that a negative value means: A receives the magnitude of the value. To find the best strategy for this game, A needs to minimize $E\{(U_{(i)} - p_i^A)^2\}$, which is minimized for $p_i = E\{U_{(i)}\} = i/(n+1)$.

- **Game (4):** A and B play a game based on the result of a new sample, X_f, drawn from the true distribution. A judge will keep sampling from the true distribution until X_f: falls between $q_X(p_i^A)$ and $X_{(i)}$, but not between $q_X(p_B^i)$ and $X_{(i)}$, in which case A pays one dollar to B; or falls between $q_X(p_B)$ and $X_{(i)}$, but not between $q_X(p_A^i)$ and $X_{(i)}$, in which case B pays one dollar to A. The player A can find the best strategy by minimizing for p in $\gamma_X(X_{(i)}, q_X(p))$ and the solution is again $Med\{Beta(i, n+1-i)\}$, as shown in Theorem 2.2.

3 Approximation of the plotting positions

We have seen that the desirable solution for the plotting position, p_i in many frameworks has turned out to be the median of the Beta distribution: $Beta(i, n+1-i)$, which is equal to the solution of the equation

$$H(i,n) := \sum_{j=i}^{n} \binom{n}{j} x^j (1-x)^{n-j} = 1/2, \tag{7}$$

and also appears in Hosseini (2009) and Lozano-Aguilera, Estudillo-Martínez and Castillo-Gutiérrez (2014). By symmetry of PIV (Theorem 2.1), we need to solve either $H(i,n),\ i \leq n/2$ or $H(i,n),\ i \geq n/2$. Since the polynomials $H(i,n),\ i \geq n/2$ are all increasing in x, a bisection method can be used to find the solution with any desired accuracy. However, this method becomes slow for large n because of the binomial coefficients calculation. Fortunately, a fast algorithm for calculating the quantiles of the Beta distribution is developed by Cran, Martin and Thomas (1977) which is implemented in C and R languages. Below we compare the values obtained from this algorithm with the exact values as well as some other popular approximations suggested in the literature. Explicitly note that the solution obtained through the bisection algorithm will be called Exact method since it can be found with any desired accuracy (i.e., the length of the interval obtained at the last iteration). Despite the existence of good algorithms to approximate the median of Beta distribution, many authors and packages use simpler formulas for approximating the median for the QQ-plot purpose.

There are various measures of the form $p_i = (i-a)/(n+b)$ suggested in the literature to approximate the median of the corresponding Beta distribution which is the same as the solution to $H(i,n) = 1/2$. Due to the existence of more exact solutions for the median such as the one developed by Cran, Martin and Thomas (1977) (Cran's Method), there is little practical need for solutions of the form $p_i = (i-a)/(n+b)$. However, because of the popularity of these solutions and their implementation in commercial software, it is interesting to compare the accuracy of different choices for a and b. In particular we require a and b to satisfy the following constraints:

(1) $p_i = (i-a)/(n+b)$ should be equal to $1/2$, when n is odd and $i = (n+1)/2$.
Let $n = 2k+1$ then by assuming above we have $(k+1-a)/(2k+1+b) = 1/2 \Leftrightarrow b = 1-2a$. This condition is also stated in Erto and Lepore (2013).

(2) Symmetry: $p_i = 1 - p_{n-i+1}$.
From above we conclude:

$$\frac{i-a}{n+b} = 1 - \frac{n-i+1-a}{n+b} \Leftrightarrow b = 1-2a,$$

which is the same as the requirement for holding (1). This is equivalent to Postulate 4 in Erto and Lepore (2009).

(3) $p_1 = 1 - p_n$ should behave the same as $1 - (1/2)^{1/n}$ in the limit:

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1-(1/2)^{1/n}}{\frac{1-a}{n+b}} = 1.$$

Calculating the limit using the L'Hôpital's rule, we have:

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1-(1/2)^{1/n}}{\frac{1-a}{n+b}} = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{-(-1/n^2(1/2)^{1/n}\log(1/2))}{-(1-a)/(n+b)^2} = \frac{-\log(1/2)}{1-a}, \tag{8}$$

where log denotes the natural logarithm. Letting the limit equal to 1, we get $a = 1 - \log 2$.

Finding plotting positions which satisfy conditions such as the above are referred to as axiomatic approach in Erto and Lepore (2013). In the above, (1) and (2) imply that $b = 1 - 2a$, which is the form widely suggested in the literature. Also (3) suggests $a = 1 - \log 2$. Combining this with (1), we get $p_i = (i-a)/(n+1-2a)$, $a = \log(e/2) \approx 0.3068528$. Erto and Lepore (2013) suggests using $a = n + \frac{n-1}{2^{1/n}-2}$ which depends on n and has the correct limit of $\log(e/2)$. This is not surprising because the derivation of Erto and Lepore (2013) is equivalent to letting $p_n = (n-a)/(n+1-2a) = (1/2)^{1/n}$.

In Table 1, we have calculated the log PIV for $n = 2, \cdots, 5$ using the Exact method; the Cran method; Erto method; $a = \log(e/2)$ method; Kerman (2011) method ($a = 1/3$). By definition, all these methods are symmetric and we only need to compare the lower or upper half of the PIV vector. We have chosen the lower half because the difference among the methods are more significant on the log scale in the lower half. For an odd n, the position of the middle value is the same theoretically for all methods and equal to $\log(1/2)$ and therefore we have omitted that value. By definition, the Erto method matches the tail values at p_1, p_n and therefore it is exact for $n = 1, 2, 3$ as shown in the table. It starts to deviate from the exact values for larger n and for positions which are not very close to $i = 1, n$ or $i = n/2$. We observe that the Cran method for all $n = 2, \cdots, 5$ is exact. Also $a = \log(e/2)$ method, which is asymptotically the same as Erto method, performs close to the exact values. Kerman method performs poorly, especially for p_1 (and therefore p_n). This poor performance of Kerman method cannot be remedied even for large n, since in order to capture the correct limit one has to let $a = \log(e/2)$.

Figure 1 compares the approximated log positions to the exact log positions (grey line) for larger sample sizes, $n = 10, 20, \cdots, 150$ and for the positions 1 (Left Top Panel); $(1/10)n$ (Top Right Panel); $(2/10)n$ (Bottom Left Panel); $(4/10)n$ (Bottom Right Panel). The Cran method is given in dashed line; Erto method is given in dotted line; the $a = \log(e/2)$ method is given in filled circles; the $a = 1/3$ method is given in triangles. Note that the sample sizes, n, are chosen to be multiples of 10 in order to get an integer position for all cases. In all panels we observe that the Cran method is almost exact. The Erto method (dotted) and $a = \log(e/2)$ method (filled circles) are very close to exact value



Figure 1: Figure compares the approximated log positions to the exact log positions (grey line) for $n = 50, 60, \cdots, 150$ and for the positions 1 (Left Top Panel); $(1/10)n$ (Top Right Panel); $(2/10)n$ (Bottom Left Panel); $(4/10)n$ (Bottom Right Panel). The Cran method is given in dashed line; Erto method is given in dotted line; the $a = \log(e/2)$ method is given in filled circles; Kerman method is given in triangles.

for p_1 and start to deviate from the exact value (larger than) for $(1/10)n$ and $(2/10)n$ positions. On the contrary the $a = 1/3$ method (triangles) is poor for p_1 and start to be more accurate for $(1/10)n$ and $(2/10)n$. Finally all methods start to be close to the exact as we move toward $n/2$ as seen in $(4/10)n$.

4 Comparison

This subsection briefly compares the plotting positions from the Weibull method (WM) and the Beta Median (BM) method. We denote their corresponding PIV by $\text{PIV}^W = (p_1^W, \cdots, p_n^W)$ and $\text{PIV}^B = (p_1^B, \cdots, p_n^B)$. Figure 2 compares BM to the WM for $n = 2, 3, 4, 5$, showing that BM chooses larger values for $p_i,\ i > n/2$ and smaller values for $p_i,\ i < n/2$ as compared to WM. The difference is most noticeable at p_1 and p_n where quantiles closer to the tails of the distribution are compared to $X_{(1)}$ and $X_{(n)}$. To compare WM and BM for arbitrary n, we use a Theorem of Payton, L. J. Young and J. H. Young (1989) on the difference of the mean and median of the Beta distribution, which has not received the attention it deserves in the plotting positions literature. This theorem states

Table 1: Comparing the approximating methods for the natural logarithm of quantiles for $n = 2, \cdots, 5$. The values different from corresponding exact values are shown in bold.

Method	$n = 2,\ (p_1)$	$n = 3,\ (p_1)$	$n = 4, (p_1, p_2)$	$n = 5, (p_1, p_2)$
Exact	-1.228	-1.578	-1.838 -0.9526	-2.044 -1.159
Cran	-1.228	-1.578	-1.838 -0.9526	-2.044 -1.159
Erto	-1.228	-1.578	-1.838 **-0.9510**	-2.044 **-1.156**
$a = \log(e/2)$	**-1.236**	**-1.586**	**-1.845 -0.9519**	**-2.050 -1.157**
Kerman	**-1.253**	**-1.609**	**-1.872 -0.9555**	**-2.079 -1.163**



Figure 2: The Weibull quantile positions (black triangle) are compared to Beta Median positions (grey circles) for $n = 2, \cdots, 5$.

that if $X \sim Beta(\alpha, \beta),\ \alpha, \beta > 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < E\{X\} - q_X(1/2) < |\alpha - \beta|/\{(\alpha+\beta)(\alpha+\beta-2)\}, \quad & \alpha < \beta \\ 0 < q_X(1/2) - E\{X\} < |\alpha - \beta|/\{(\alpha+\beta)(\alpha+\beta-2)\}, \quad & \alpha > \beta \\ q_X(1/2) = E\{X\}, \quad & \alpha = \beta, \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where we have corrected line 2 of the statement (changed $0 < E\{X\} - q_X(1/2)$ to $0 < q_X(1/2) - E\{X\}$).

In the following, we present a theorem which clarifies the relationship between the WM and BM. We compare the plotting positions in terms of their difference and their ratio. The theorem provides a bound for the difference of p_i^W and p_i^M, which is smaller for central positions and smaller than $1/(n+1)$ for all positions. Also we find the bound of $1/i$ for the ratio of p_i^B and p_i^W. Since p_i^B and p_i^W are larger than $1/2$ for $i > n/2$, we compare also the ratio of $1-p_i^B$ and $1-p_i^W$ and show it is bounded by $1/(n+1-i)$. In summary, for the first half of the PIV, when we move away from $i = 1$ toward the center, the ratio becomes small rapidly. For the second half of PIV, when we move from $i = n$ toward the center, the ratio of $1-p_i^B$ and $1-p_i^W$ becomes small rapidly. However the ratio of p_i^B and p_i^W, at the beginning of PIV (in particular for $i = 1$) and the ratio of $1-p_i^B$ and $1-p_i^W$ at the end of PIV (in particular for $i = n$), are not close to 1 (even for large n). In fact we show that both ratios are asymptotically equal to $\log(2) \approx 0.69$. The exact statements for these claims are given in the following theorem, in which $[m]$ denotes the largest integer less than or equal to m.

Theorem 4.1 *Assume $n > 2$ is a natural number. Also let*

$$PIV^W = (p_1^W, \cdots, p_n^W), \text{ and } PIV^B = (p_1^B, \cdots, p_n^B),$$

denote the PIV for the Weibull method (WM) and Beta Median (BM) method respectively. Then the following results hold.

(a) $0 < p_i^W - p_i^B < |n+1-2i|/(n^2-1),\ i = 1, \cdots, [n/2]$.

(b) $0 < p_i^B - p_i^W < |n+1-2i|/(n^2-1),\ i = [n/2]+1, \cdots, n$.

(c) $p_i^W = p_i^B,\ i = (n+1)/2$, *if n is odd.*

(d) $|p_i^W - p_i^B| < 1/(n+1),\ i = 1, \cdots, n$.

(e) $0 < p_1^B < p_1^W < 1$ *and* $0 < p_n^W < p_n^B < 1$.

(f) $p_{i-1}^W < p_i^B < p_i^W,\ i = 2, \cdots, [n/2]$

(g) $p_{i-1}^B < p_i^W < p_i^B,\ i = [n/2]+1, \cdots, (n-1)$

(h) $|p_i^B/p_i^W - 1| < |n+1-2i|/\{i(n-1)\} < 1/i,\ i = 1, \cdots, n$.

(i) $|(1-p_i^B)/(1-p_i^W) - 1| < |n+1-2i|/\{(n+1-i)(n-1)\} < 1/(n-i),\ i = 1, \cdots, n$.

(j) $\lim_{n\to\infty} p_1^B/p_1^W = \lim_{n\to\infty}(1-p_n^B)/(1-p_n^W) = \log(2)$.

Proof For the proof, we apply Equation 9 (Payton, L. J. Young and J. H. Young (1989)) to $\alpha = i$ and $\beta = n+1-i$ and use the fact that $p_i^B = Med\{Beta(i, n+1-i)\}$ and $p_i^B = Mean\{Beta(i, n+1-i)\}$.

(a) Since $i = 2, \cdots, [n/2]$, we have $i = \alpha \neq \beta = n-1$. Then we apply Equation 9 (line 1). The case $i = 1$ needs a special treatment because $\alpha = 1$. In this case $|n+1-2i|/(n^2-1) = 1/(n+1)$. Since $p_1^W = 1/(n+1)$ we only need to show $p_1^B < 1/(n+1)$ for $n \geq 3$. However in this case $\alpha = 1, \beta = n$ and the density function of $X \sim Beta(\alpha, \beta)$ is decreasing. This will conclude the median is smaller than the mean by various methods. For example by noting that the median=$\inf_\mu E\{|X-\mu|\}$ and mean=$\inf_\mu E\{|X-\mu|^2\}$.

(b) This follows from the above and the Beta distribution symmetry.

(c) Since $i = (n+1)/2$, $\alpha = \beta = n+1-i = (n+1)/2$ and and we apply Equation 9 (line 3).

(d) This follows from the above by noting that $|n+1-2i|/(n^2-1) \leq 1/(n+1)$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$.

(e) Straight forward from above.

(f) This follows from $(p_i^W - p_i^B) < 1/(n+1)$, $i = 1, \cdots, [n/2]$ and noting that $p_i^W = i/(n+1)$, which implies in PIV^W two consecutive elements differ exactly by $1/(n+1)$.

(g) This follows from the above and the symmetry of Beta distribution.

(h) We showed that $p_i^B = p_i^W + R_i$ where $|R_i| < |n+1-2i|/(n^2-1)$. Thus

$$|p_i^B/p_i^W - 1| = |(p_i^W + R_i)/p_i^W - 1| = \frac{|R_i|}{i/(n+1)} < |n+1-2i|/\{i(n-1)\} < 1/i.$$

(i) This follows from above and the symmetry of PIV.

(j) This follows from the limit argument given in Equation 8 for $a = 0$, $b = 1$, in which case $(1+a)/(n+b) = 1/(n+1) = p_1^W$.

■

5 Discussion

This work investigated the plotting positions problem using various frameworks: distribution-theoretic; decision-theoretic; game-theoretic. While there has been a lot of previous work in this area – each suggesting a different formula for the

plotting positions – the validity and the assumptions under which any of these formulas are valid were not clear. This work addresses this issue by deriving the distribution-free plotting positions under various reasonable objectives which are understandable by practitioners.

Two solutions which came out of the analysis in the above frameworks were the Weibull (expectation of Beta) and the Beta Median methods. Despite the popularity of the Weibull method (e.g. Makkonen (2008)), we showed that it is not the only correct solution to this problem and the Beta Median method is the optimal under various scenarios – for example to minimize the probability loss function (PL) or to have more chance to win a game in which the winner picks the closest quantile from the true distribution to the given order statistics.

In this paper, we also investigated some approximations to the Beta Median method. In particular, we considered the approximations of the form $(i-a)/(n+b)$ and showed that if this approximation is to be symmetric ($p_i = 1 - p_{n+1-i}$), it should have the form $p_i = (i-a)/(n+1-2a)$ (which is also a form suggested by Blom (1958) and Erto and Lepore (2013)). To be close to the exact value at p_1, p_n, for large n, we must have $a = \log(e/2)$. In that case, we showed that it is not a very accurate approximation for example around the 10th percentile, hence concluding no such approximation of the form $(i-a)/(n+b)$ would be adequately accurate. Moreover, the approximation of Erto and Lepore (2013) allowing a to vary with n which is exact on p_1, p_n suffers from the same issue. By numerical analysis and by inspecting the limits of p_1, p_n, when n becomes large (Equation 8), we showed that another popular approximation, which assumes $a = 1/3$, while performing better in the middle of the probability index vector, it fails at the small and large indices, e.g. p_1, p_n. Fortunately our numerical analysis showed that the algorithm of Cran, Martin and Thomas (1977), which is also implemented in C and R to calculate the median of the Beta distribution, works well across the probability index vector. However this is not routinely used in making the QQ-plots in R or SPSS and instead approximations of the form $(i-a)/(n+b)$, for some a, b are used (Castillo-Gutiérrez, Lozano-Aguilera and Estudillo-Martínez (2012)). In summary, if the Weibull method is desired, then this is accurate by letting $a = 0, b = 1$. However if the Beta Median method is desired, we recommend using the algorithm of Cran, Martin and Thomas (1977) which is readily available in R.

Finally, we made a comparison between the plotting positions of Weibull method and Beta Median method, in terms of their difference and ratio. In summary the plotting positions of the two method are always close in terms of difference. They are also close in terms of their ratio toward the center of PIV, but they differ at the two ends of PIV.

Acknowledgements: We would like to thank Prof. Jim Zidek, Prof. Nhu Le and Prof. David Scott for suggestions which have improved this work. The first author was partially supported by research grants from Japanese Society for Promotion of Science.

References

Arnold, B. C., Balakrishnan, N., and Nagaraja, H. H. N. (1992). *A first course in order statistics*, Volume 54, Siam.

Beard, L. R. (1943). Statistical analysis in hydrology. *Transactions of American Society of Civil Engineering*, 108:1110–1160.

Benard, A. and Bos-Levenbach, E. C. (1953) The plotting of observations on probability paper. *Statistica*, 7:163–173.

Blom, G. (1958). *Statistical estimates and transformed Beta variables.* New York: N.Y. Wiley.

Castillo-Gutiérrez, S., Lozano-Aguilera, E., Estudillo-Martínez, M. D. (2012) Selection of a Plotting Position for a Normal Q-Q Plot. R Script. *Journal of Communication and Computer,* 9:243–250.

Cran, G. W., Martin, K. J. and G. E. Thomas (1977). Remark AS R19 and Algorithm AS 109. *Applied Statistics*, 26:111–114.

Cunnane, C. (1978) Unbiased plotting positions – A review. *Journal of Hydrology*, 37(3–4):205–222

De, M. (2000). A new unbiased plotting position formula for Gumbel distribution. *Stochastic Environmental Research and Risk Assessment 14*, Springer-Verlag, 1–7.

Erto P. and Lepore, A. (2009). New plotting positions approach to reliability estimates from small and censored samples. *Proceedings of 18th Advances in Risk and Reliability Technology Symposium*, 21–23 April, University of Loughborough, UK, 221–227.

Erto, P. and Lepore, A. (2013). New Distribution-Free Plotting Position Through an Approximation to the Beta Median. *In: Torelli, N., Pesarin, F. and Bar-Hen, A. eds. Advances in Theoretical and Applied Statistics Studies in Theoretical and Applied Statistics*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 23–27.

Folland, C. and Anderson, C. (2002). Estimating changing extremes using empirical ranking methods. *Journal of Climate*, 15:2954–2960.

Harter, H. L. (1984). Another look at plotting positions. *Communications in Statistics – Theory and Methods*, 13:1613–1633.

Hosseini, R. (2009). *Statistical Models for Agroclimate Risk Analysis.* PhD thesis, Department of Statistics, University of British Columbia.

Hosseini, R. (2010). An invariant loss function for quantile approximation, estimation and summarizing data. *University of British Columbia, Department of Statistics, Technical Report.*

Kerman, J. (2011). A closed-form approximation for the median of the Beta distribution. *arXiv:1111.0433.*

Lozano-Aguilera, E. D., Estudillo-Martínez, M. D. and Castillo-Gutiérrez, S. (2014). A proposal for plotting positions in probability plots. *Journal of Applied Statistics*, 41(1):118–126.

Makkonen, L. (2006). Plotting Positions in Extreme Value Analysis. *Journal of Applied Meteorology Climatology*, 45:334–340.

Makkonen, L. (2008). Bringing Closure to the Plotting Position Controversy. *Communications in Statistics – Theory and Methods*, 37:460–467.

Payton, M. E., Young, L. J., Young, J. H. (1989). Bounds for the difference between median and mean of Beta and negative binomial distributions. *Metrika*, 36(1):347–354.

Weibull, W. (1939). *A statistical theory of strength of materials.* Handlingar/Ingeniörsvetenskapsakademien (Stockholm), Volume 151.

Yu, G. H., Huang, C. C. (2001). A distribution-free plotting position. *Stochastic Environmental Research and Risk Assessment*, 15(6):462–476.